THE UNIVERSITY of EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

Aurelius Victor and the ending of Sallust's Jugurtha

Citation for published version:
Stover, J & Woudhuysen, G 2021, 'Aurelius Victor and the ending of Sallust's Jugurtha', *Hermathena*, vol. 199.

Link:
Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer

Document Version:
Peer reviewed version

Published In:
Hermathena

General rights
Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy
The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Download date: 04. May. 2023

Aurelius Victor and the Ending of Sallust's *Jugurtha*

Abstract: In his De Caesaribus*, the historian Aurelius Victor drew a comparison between the emperor Diocletian and the Republican general and consul Marius: two ambitious individuals from humble backgrounds who had dressed in an excessively extravagant and arrogant fashion. That comparison used an allusion to what is now a fragment of Sallust (Maurenbrecher 2.62) to sharpen its point. This article shows that the conventional interpretation of the fragment (as a reference to the battle of Sucro) is unlikely and that it instead relates to Marius' dress at his triumph over Jugurtha: it logically belongs to Sallust's monograph, not his* Histories *(for which it is too early in date). At first sight, there appears to be no place in the* Jugurtha *for it, but the article then argues that there are strong reasons to think that the work is not complete, but is missing its closing portion. Transmission, testimonia, and literary features combine to suggest that it is a mutilated text. The article concludes that the fragment belongs to the lost end of the* Jugurtha*, and suggests an outline of what that ending might have contained. That was where Victor found it and exploited it to draw a pointed comparison between emperor and general*.

At *Caes.* 39.1-6, the mid-fourth-century historian Sex. Aurelius Victor discusses the sartorial innovations of the emperor Diocletian and, provoked by them, turns to reflections on history more generally:

… Valerius Diocletianus domesticos regens ob sapientiam deligitur, magnus vir, his

moribus tamen: quippe qui primus ex auro veste quaesita serici ac purpurae gemmarum[que] vim plantis concupiverit… Quis rebus, quantum ingenium <mihi> est, compertum habeo humillimos quosque, maxime ubi alta accesserint, superbia atque ambitione immodicos esse. **Hinc Marius patrum memoria, hinc iste nostra communem habitum supergressi, dum animus potentiae expers tamquam inedia refecti insatiabilis est.**[1]

… Valerius Diocletian, then in command of the *domestici*, was selected [*sc*. as emperor] on account of his wisdom. He was a great man, albeit with the following quirks: he was, in fact, the first who, since clothing of silk and purple made from gold had <already> been sought out, lusted after the might of gems for his feet… From these facts, I have concluded, as far as my intelligence allows, that all most lowly men, especially when they have reached the heights <of power>, are excessive in their pride and ambition. **For this reason, Marius in the recollection of our ancestors and this man in our own**

We would like to thank Dr Gavin Kelly for important initial encouragement, Dr S.J.V. Malloch for careful commentary on a draft, and Dr. Tiziana D'Angelo for aid with some particularly tangled Italian.

Throughout, we use the following abbreviations:

BAV = Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana
CIL = Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum
CLA = Codices Latini Antiquiores
GLK = Keil (ed.), *Grammatici Latini*

In references to the *De compendiosa doctrina* of Nonius Marcellus, M = the edition of Mercier (for cross-reference) and L = the edition of Lindsay 1903.

[1] The passage has textual problems. Shackleton Bailey 1981, 180 inserts *usum contempserit* after *purpurae*, making Diocletian's innovation the wearing of gold cloth, and reads *conculcauerit* for *concupiuerit*, since 'Emperors do not covet things, whether for their feet or their heads; they wear what they want'. The latter conclusion is unlikely, since in context (as in Victor more generally) concupiscence seems entirely appropriate. The simplest solution is to delete *que* after *gemmarum* (as here; though it must be conceded that the expression is still rather odd), which makes Diocletian's novelty jewelled sandals, as it is in the clearly related account of Eutropius 9.26.1: *ornamenta gemmarum vestibus calcamentisque indidit*. Ammianus (15.5.8) also attributed changes in the imperial *salutatio* to Diocletian. Claudian, *In Eutropium* 1.181 is intriguingly close to another of Victor's ideas: *asperius nihil est humili cum surgit in altum*.

> **exceeded the common style of dress, since a mind without experience of power, as though suffering from starvation, cannot be satisfied by refreshment**.

Victor connected the extravagant dress of the first among Tetrarchs with other novelties of his reign: the way that Diocletian allowed himself to be addressed as *dominus*, to be referred to and even worshipped as a god.[2] To Victor, such was a return to the regrettable habits of Caligula and Domitian. To other historians, like Ammianus (15.5.8), these were a foreign custom, imported and incorporated into the ritual that is now generally called *adoratio*.[3] They were, in either case, a final abandonment of the more outward signs of *civilitas*, the ideal of the emperor *qua* citizen in his public mien, dress, and conduct.[4] It was, however, Diocletian's clothes in particular that had prompted Victor to his more general reflections. In this, he was in a long tradition, for imperial garb, and in particular the outrageous innovations that certain emperors had made in their personal style, were favourite subjects for the later Roman historian, cropping up in a wide range of texts. The *Historia Augusta* repeatedly touches on the topic, drawing attention (for instance) to the jewelled clothes of Gallienus, who wore a purple mantle fastened with gold and bejewelled broaches, where earlier emperors had been content with a toga (*Gall.* 16.4).[5] The *Epitome de Caesaribus*, so-called, made Aurelian a key figure in the history of imperial dress:

> Iste primus apud Romanos diadema capiti innexuit, gemmisque et aurata omni veste, quod adhuc fere incognitum Romanis moribus visebatur, usus est.[6]

---

[2] Aurelius Victor, *De Caesaribus* 39.4

[3] The text of Ammianus is very difficult at this point, but the general idea seems clear and Diocletian must be the emperor meant. On *adoratio* in general, see Matthews 2007, 244-247, with interesting remarks on this passage. See also Avery 1940; Stern 1954.

[4] See the perspicuous analysis of Wallace-Hadrill 1982; *idem* 1983, 162-166.

[5] *cf. Heliog*. 26.1; *Sev. Alex*. 40.1; *Aurel*. 45.4.

[6] *Epitome* 31.5.

> He, first amongst the Romans, wore a diadem on his head, and always used clothing with gold and gems, which till then seemed almost unknown to Roman custom.

So, Victor was part of a tradition (going back to Suetonius) that linked reflections on imperial clothing to the characters and actions of emperors; perhaps he was even the writer who most influenced other fourth-century historians to touch on the topic.[7]

It is not, however, the precise identity of Rome's greatest fashion-innovator, but rather the last sentence – the moral lesson that Victor drew from Diocletian's dress – that concerns us here. This is a perfect illustration of the complex allusivity that characterises Victor's work. The form of the sentence imitates a line from Cicero's third *Philippic*, where the orator is defending Octavian against Antony's sneer that his mother came from Aricia. The town, Cicero averred, was a distinguished and important one (*Phil.* 3.16):

> **hinc** Voconiae, **hinc** Atiniae leges; **hinc** multae sellae curules **et patrum memoria et nostra**; hinc equites Romani lautissimi et plurimi.
>
> From here [Aricia] came the Voconian and Atinian laws; from here came many curule chairs, both in the memory of our fathers and our own; from here came Roman knights, very noble and very numerous.

Respectable people, in other words, came from places such as Aricia and they might achieve great and deserved distinction. Rather characteristically, Victor is here making the opposite point: that people from modest backgrounds who achieve power are more likely to succumb to the

[7] *cf. e.g.* Eutropius 8.13.2 (Marcus Aurelius). Suetonius' interest in clothes: see, *e.g.* Wallace-Hadrill 1983, 48. On the use of purple, see Reinhold 1970, esp. 48-61, though (*caveat lector*) deductions from the *Historia Augusta* about the *realia* of imperial style should be held in grave suspicion. On imperial dress and *insignia* in general, see Alföldi 1935, esp. 57-69. The section on the dress of magistrates in Mommsen 1887, i 408-435 also remains useful.

temptations of pride and a lust for power. To illustrate the point, he compares Diocletian, of humble Dalmatian stock, with the famously low-born Marius: *tam humili Arpini, tam ignobili Romae, tam fastidiendo candidato*.[8] Both, he claims, were starved for recognition before obtaining power and both, once they obtained it, displayed a boundless appetite for grandeur, one which extended to their choice of costume.[9] They went beyond the *communis habitus* (normally a reference to the toga) and clad themselves with clothes that were hardly fitting to a Roman citizen.[10]

Cicero, however, was not the limit of Victor's allusive range. It has been noted in passing that the words *communem habitum supergressi* were inspired by Sallust.[11] Priscian cited a brief phrase from the Republican historian to illustrate the use of verbs with the prefix *trans*: *Sallustius: communem habitum transgressus, pro 'supergressus'* (14, *GL* 3.39). This collocation – of *communis habitus* with a participle *-gressus* – is used in antiquity only by Victor and Sallust, so it seems certain that the former was alluding to the latter.[12] This is hardly surprising, for Victor was more influenced by Sallust than by any other Latin author.[13] He did not, however simply stud his prose with *flosculi Sallustiani*, as La Penna calls them – at times, he really engaged with Sallust's text and methods.[14] In a famous passage in the *Catiline*, Sallust embarks on an autobiographical excursus detailing the reason why he first undertook historical investigation,

[8] Diocletian: Jones, Martindale, Morris 1971, 254 ('Diocletianus 2'); Barnes 1982, 31. Regardless of the precise accuracy of the information in the fourth-century sources, Diocletian was clearly from a humble background. Marius: Valerius Maximus 6.9.14, *cf*. Plut. *Marius* 3.1. The idea still resonated in late antiquity: Sidonius Apollinaris, *Carm*. 2.230, calls Marius a *lixa*. On Marius in general, see Evans 1994.
[9] The *ambitio* of Marius was almost proverbial in antiquity: Sallust, *Iug*. 63.6; Seneca *Ep*. 94.66. *cf*. The very negative character sketch in Cassius Dio, *Hist*. 26.89.2
[10] *Communis habitus* as toga: [Asconius], *in Verr*. II.1 *enarratio* 113.
[11] Funari 1996, i 381.
[12] For the (few) references to the *communis habitus*, see below p. CHECK; no other author talks of exceeding it.
[13] See, *e.g*, Wölfflin 1874, 285-287; Opitz 1883; Bird 1984, 90-99.
[14] La Penna 2004/05.

namely to understand the causes of Rome's historical greatness:

> Sed **mihi multa legenti**, **multa audienti**, quae populus Romanus domi militiaeque, mari atque terra praeclara facinora fecit, forte lubuit adtendere, quae res maxume tanta negotia sustinuisset.[15]
>
> But in me, when I was reading and hearing about the many noble deeds which the Roman people did at home and on campaign, at sea and on land, there came by chance the desire to turn my attention to those factors in particular which had supported such great achievements.

Victor uses this passage to give his own answer, namely that Rome was continually refreshed by the virtue of those born elsewhere and their 'transplanted talents':

> Ac **mihi** quidem **audienti multa legenti**que plane compertum urbem Romam externorum virtute atque insitivis artibus praecipue crevisse.[16]
>
> And indeed to me, based on the many things I have heard and read, it is completely obvious that the city of Rome has in particular grown great by the virtue and transplanted talents of outsiders.

The point is a sharp one, because (of course) Sallust goes on to say that the immoderate greatness of their empire (*luxus* and *desidia*) caused the decline of the Roman people (*Cat*. 53.4). So Victor, as fitted someone deeply attached to Rome but born in Africa, riposted that Rome's strength might be refreshed by outsiders, by the peoples who had become part of its empire.[17]

---

[15] Sallust, *Cat*. 53.2.
[16] Victor, *Caes*. 11.13; See Penella 1983, 234.
[17] African origin: *Caes*. 20.6.

This is more than a passing nod to one of the canonical Latin authors – this is deep and considered engagement with Sallust's ideas as well as with his style. One of the other reflective uses to which Victor put Sallust was to draw parallels between figures in Republican and Imperial history, normally by inserting just a few significant words. Pompey and Septimius Severus are both described as *in extremis terris bellum gerebat* (*Cat.* 16.5 ~ *Caes.* 19.4).[18] Nero and Catiline both acted in a way contrary to *ius fasque* by fornicating with a Vestal Virgin (*Cat.* 15.1 ~ *Caes.* 5.13).[19] Lepidus and Gallienus both received support from *lenones* and *vinarii* (*Hist.* 1 fr. 63 ~ *Caes.* 33.6).[20] Comparing Marius and Diocletian by using a Sallustian turn of phrase and using that comparison to make a deeper point about Roman history is, then, entirely consistent with Victor's methods.

There is, however, a problem here. The words quoted by Priscian do not occur in either of Sallust's monographs. For this reason, the text has generally been assigned to his fragmentary *Histories* (fr. 2.62 Maurenbrecher). Unfortunately, so jejune a phrase gives very little hint as to its broader context. Maurenbrecher, though expressing great uncertainty, linked it to the gargantuan soldier who wounded Pompey at the battle of Sucro in 75 B.C. (Plut. *Pomp*. 19.2), which would suggest that it means something like 'going beyond normal size'.[21] Funari took a different approach, dismissing the link to Plutarch and arguing in a rather involved commentary that Sallust was referring to some moral transgression.[22] Maurenbrecher's tentative suggestion, however, has become the standard interpretation, found in the translations of both McGushin and

[18] A phrase used by no other authors in antiquity.
[19] *ius fasque* is (obviously) not a rare phrase, but the Vestal Virgin secures the link.
[20] Trades yoked together by no other authors in antiquity.
[21] Maurenbrecher 1891-1893, ii 85.
[22] Funari 1996, i .381-2: 'il luogo sallustiano si riferisca a qualche personaggio distintosi per avere trasgredito la comune misura dell'àbito etico'; Plutarch is 'una fonte parallel poco probabile'. He cites Quintilian 2.5.11 as a passage which might support an interpretation 'in senso fisico', but there the phrase must mean 'the normal human condition' (see Reinhardt, Winterbottom 2006, *ad loc.*, 130).

Ramsey.[23]

Neither the interpretation of Maurenbrecher nor that of Funari is completely satisfactory. It seems decidedly odd that Victor would link Diocletian to a central character in Sallust with a Sallustian phrase that referred in its original context to an utterly insignificant figure: an anonymous, if rather substantial, soldier of Sertorius (ἀνὴρ μέγας in Plutarch's words). Equally, the comparison to Marius would seem to lose much of its point if the reference was only a generalising one to misconduct, rather than to some more specific misdeed – after all, as the extract above shows, Victor's attitude to Diocletian was far from straightforwardly negative. The main difficulty, however, with the prevailing reconstructions of Sallust's meaning is that in Victor (focused as he is on Diocletian's dress) the phrase *communem habitum* must mean 'common clothing' and there is very good evidence that that was its (as it were) habitual sense. Ps-Asconius glosses *toga* in *Verr.* 2.1.113 as the *communis habitus*: *Toga communis habitus fuit et marium et feminarum, sed praetexta honestiorum, toga viliorum*, 'the toga was the common clothing of both men and women, but the *toga praetexta* for those of noble birth, and a plain toga for the masses.' The same meaning is attested in Rufinus' translations (*Reg. Bas.* 11.7 (p. 52 ed. Zelzer) and Euseb. 6.19.14 (p. 563 ed. Mommsen)). A text closely related to Victor, the so-called *Epitome de Caesaribus*, also uses the phrase of Diocletian after his retirement, clearly referring to dress (39.7): *Vixit annos sexaginta octo, ex quis communi habitu prope novem egit*, 'he lived for sixty-eight years, of which he spent nearly nine in ordinary dress'.[24] Eutropius (9.26.1), perhaps inspired by Victor, describes Diocletian's jewelled sandals and then says: *nam prius imperii insigne in chlamyde purpurea tantum erat, reliqua* ***communia***, 'for before [Diocletian],

[23] McGushin 1992-1994, i 53, fr. II.53, 'he was of above average height and build', with a note summarising the story from Plut. *Pompey*. Ramsey 2015, II.51, 161, 'surpassing the normal build', also notes the story in Plutarch, but is more tentative. The identification was also accepted by La Penna 1963, 36 n. 3.
[24] Suetonius, *Domit.* 4.4 uses *habitus* for Domitian's official attire as well.

the mark of imperial power was in the purple cloak alone, his remaining <clothes> being the common ones'. The adjective *communis* was commonly (so to speak) deployed with various words for clothing to indicate what people normally wore, in contradistinction to more special or particular dress.[25] Given that we know that Victor often typed late Roman emperors after figures in Sallust through allusion to his works and that Sallust discussed Marius' career at length in the *Jugurtha*, the natural conclusion is that in its original context *communem habitum transgressus* in fact referred to Marius and some sartorial choice that he had made.[26]

That would make a good deal of sense, because there was a famous incident in the career of Marius which would suit Victor's allusive needs precisely. On the 1st of January 104 B.C., Marius celebrated a triumph for his victory over Jugurtha.[27] During that triumph, as was customary, he wore the *vestis triumphalis*, a garment interwoven with gold (Pliny, *nat*. 9.127: *in triumphali [sc. veste] miscetur auro*).[28] In open defiance of tradition, or else through forgetfulness, Marius did not remove this attire and resume the usual toga when he entered the senate house.[29] That this incident played a large role in the sixty-seventh book of Livy is strongly

---

[25] Ambrose, *De officiis* 1.19.83: *non pretisosis et albentibus adiutus **vestimentis** sed **communibus***. *Digest* 34.2.23.2: ***Vestimenta** omnia aut virilia sunt aut puerilia aut muliebria aut **communia** aut familiarica*. Ammianus 14.11.20: *ablatis regiis indumentis Caesarem tunica texit et **paludamento communi***. Rufinus, translating Origen *In Leviticum homiliae* 9.1: *et segregatis a reliquorum hominum **communibus indumentis***; 11.1: *ad ceteros vero usus communes utatur **communibus indumentis***.

[26] It is of course theoretically possible that the Sallustian phrase relates to neither the soldier of Sertorius, nor Marius, but instead to an unknown individual, in an unknown incident, in an unknown part of one of Sallust's works. Such a conclusion really would, however, multiply entities beyond necessity.

[27] See Degrassi 1947, 84-85, 561-562. On Marius' triumphs in general, see the lucid remarks of Hjort Lange 2016, 38-40. On the triumph in 104 B.C., see in particular Richard 1994, esp. 74-82.

[28] On the dress of the *triumphator*, see Mommsen 1887, 411-422; Weinstock 1971, 67-68; Versnel 1970, 56-57; Beard 2007, 225-233.

[29] Evans 1994, 81 n. 89 argues (on the basis of the *Periochae*) that Marius was granted the right to wear his triumphal dress as an honour and that Plutarch's version of the story is apocryphal (*cf*. Beard 2007, 273, which hints at support for the idea). This seems unlikely and is based largely on the dubious assumption that an experienced politician like Marius would not have made such an 'elementary error'. If the wording of the *Periochae* reflects Livy's original (which is possible but not certain), then it is somewhat ambiguous (*cf*. 27.8.2 on the election of the first plebeian *maximus curio*) and need not necessarily be negative (Richard 1994, 74 is perhaps too emphatic that it must be). However, both Plutarch and Cassius Dio (whose account is not obviously derived from the former – see below) present the incident as aberrant and deeply controversial. Richard's suggestion (78) that Marius used his exceptional day to test the senate's attitude to such an act may be closer to the mark.

suggested by the *Periochae* (67):

> Marius triumphali veste in senatum venit, quod nemo ante eum fecerat, eique propter metum Cimbrici belli continuatus per conplures annos est consulatus.
>
> Marius came into the senate in his triumphal dress, which thing no man had done before him; and, because of fear of the war against the Cimbri, his consulship was renewed for several years.

Our most detailed surviving account of the event, however, comes from Plutarch (*Marius* 12.5):

> μετὰ δὲ τὴν πομπὴν ὁ Μάριος σύγκλητον ἤθροισεν ἐν Καπετωλίῳ: καὶ παρῆλθε μὲν εἴτε λαθὼν αὐτὸν εἴτε τῇ τύχῃχρώμενος ἀγροικότερον ἐν τῇ θριαμβικῇ σκευῇ, ταχὺ δὲ τὴν βουλὴν ἀχθεσθεῖσαν αἰσθόμενος ἐξανέστη καὶ μεταλαβὼν τὴν περιπόρφυρον αὖθις ἦλθεν.
>
> After the triumphal procession, Marius convoked the senate in the Capitol: he came in, either having forgotten it or enjoying his fortune in a rather boorish fashion, in his triumphal attire; swiftly perceiving that the senate was unhappy about this, he left his seat and, when he had substituted <a toga> edged with purple, came in again.

Cassius Dio confirms the broad outline of Plutarch's story. Dio's account of the war with Jugurtha and its aftermath falls in the fragmentary books 26-27 and so is unfortunately lacunose. We can however be confident that he dealt with the incident in the senate in some detail. In describing the triumph of L. Antonius on the 1st of January 41 B.C., Dio records that the *triumphator* compared himself favourably to Marius (48.4.5):

καὶ προσέτι καὶ ὑπὲρ ἐκεῖνον ἠγάλλετο, λέγων αὐτὸς μὲν ἐθελοντὴς τά τε τῆς πομπῆς κοσμήματα ἀποτεθεῖσθαι καὶ τὴν βουλὴν ἐν τῇ ἀγοραίῳ στολῇ ἠθροικέναι, τὸν δὲ δὴ Μάριον ἄκοντα αὐτὰ πεποιηκέναι.

And moreover, he [Antonius] glorified himself even beyond that man [sc. Marius], saying that he had willingly laid aside the adornments of the triumphal procession and convoked the senate in ordinary dress, when in fact Marius had done these same things unwillingly.

It is also possible that the fame of the episode is even reflected in the *elogium* of Marius from the Augustan Forum, the last line of which tantalisingly mentions his *triumphali veste* and *calceis patriciis*.[30] The shoes are especially intriguing, given Victor's interest in footwear.[31]

The opportunity to link Marius and Diocletian was thus obvious. Marius was the first to enter the senate in a gold-embroidered toga and Diocletian was the first to wear jewelled sandals: in both cases, they went beyond the normal dress that was really appropriate for them (in the view of historians). Victor's point is perhaps sharpened by the way that Marius' transgression was to wear golden clothing, while Diocletian went *even further*, seeking jewels for his sandals at a time when golden clothing was already worn by emperors. There may be a second layer of connection between the two figures, beyond their extravagant clothing. As we have already seen, Victor connected Diocletian's dress with his self-presentation as a god. We know from other evidence that Diocletian linked himself to Jupiter in particular: he took the *signum* 'Iovius', for

[30] *CIL I.1*^{2} pp. 195-6, no. 18 = *CIL* 6.31958a; *cf*. *CIL I.1*^{2} p. 195, nr. 18a = *CIL* 6.41024. The supplement *in senatum venit* is tempting, but perhaps prejudges the issue of what the reference might be (it may also not have been something for which people wished to praise Marius). Sage 1979, 206 n. 91 collects some other readings and is sensibly cautious about all of them. *cf*. Richard 1994, 78-80 who connects the words to a putative later grant to Marius of the right to appear in the dress of a *triumphator* on certain occasions. On the *elogia* in general see Spannagel 1999, 317-344.

[31] Alas, Mommsen found little to say about the shoes and undergarments of magistrates (1887, i 423). Richard 1994, 80-82 collects other evidence and earlier theories on such footwear.

instance.[32] In late antiquity, it was not uncommon to compare the dress and appearance of the *triumphator* to Jupiter.[33] It may well be that to Victor the image of Marius in triumphal dress before the senate suggested an attempt to present himself as a divine figure, just as Diocletian had done. It is also possible that the parallels between the specific event in which Marius was involved in B.C. 104 and the career of Diocletian would have seemed still more obvious in Victor's day than we can now understand. In late 303, Diocletian made a visit to Rome to celebrate his *vicennalia* – we lack a comprehensive account of the visit, but the different fragments of description that survive are intriguing.[34] Lactantius, with biting sarcasm, makes it all seem like a disaster: the emperor hot-footing it out of the city before he could start his consulship on the 1st of January, unable to bear the *libertas dicendi* of the Roman populace.[35] The author of *On the Deaths of the Persecutors* is hardly an objective witness, but his account likely reflects some genuine controversy associated with the Roman visit – midwinter was not otherwise an ideal time to depart and indeed Diocletian caught some illness from the cold and damp of his journey.[36] We know from several other sources that this imperial appearance at Rome had also featured a triumph in which Persian captives were led before the chariot of Diocletian and Maximian.[37] It seems almost certain that the emperors also visited the *curia* at

---

[32] See Salway 1994, 139; Rees 2005. The idea crops up in the *Panegyrici Latini* (10.4.2, 7.5 *e.g.*). Victor was also well aware of it: *Caes*. 39.18. On *signa* in general, see Woudhuysen 2019.

[33] *e.g*. Servius, *Ecl*. 10.27: *unde etiam triumphantes, qui habent omnia Iovis insignia, sceptrum, palmatam … faciem quoque de rubrica inlinunt instar coloris aetherii*. *cf*. Servius 'Auctus', *Ecl*. 6.22. The question of whether the assimilation of the two is authentic to an earlier period is vexed. There are reasons to think so (*e.g.* Livy 10.7.10) and the idea has attracted a good deal of support (*e.g.* Weinstock 1971, 67-68; Versnel 1970, 56-93), but see the nuanced discussion of Beard 2007, 225-238.

[34] See Barnes 1982, 56; *idem* 1981, 24-25.

[35] Lactantius, *De mortibus persecutorum* 17.1-3. The *libertas* of the Roman people in addressing their emperors, especially at games, was proverbial, see Cameron 1976, 157-192. The *Chronography of 354* (*MGH Chronica Minora* I, 148) confirms that they spent some time in the circus when at Rome.

[36] Lactantius, *De mortibus* 17.3.

[37] Eutropius 9.27.2; Jerome, *Chronicon* Helm 227m; *Chronography of 354* (148); Jordanes, *Romana* 302; Zonaras 12.32 (Dindorf iii, 163). In general, on the triumph see the helpful article of Nixon 1981, 70-76. The question of how the wives, sisters, and children of the Persian king Narses could have appeared in the triumph, when they had apparently been returned at the peace (Peter the Patrician fr. 14) is a vexing one. Nixon suggests images of them, or

some stage – they had, after all, rebuilt it after it burnt down in the reign of Carinus.[38] This combination of a low-born *imperator*, a triumph at Rome close to the start of the new year, and some controversy that saw the *triumphator* checked is intriguing – perhaps it encouraged Victor's comparison of the emperor and the consul. A whole complex of arguments thus makes it seem very likely that the fragment of Sallust ought to be translated as 'went beyond the customary clothing' and that it ought to refer to Marius at his triumph.

We can find partial confirmation of this if we turn to the only other Latin text in antiquity to express a similar idea to that found in Victor, in words reminiscent of both Victor and Sallust: the extensive fourth-century reworking of Josephus into Latin known as the *De excidio Hierosolymitano*.[39] There (1.27, ed. Ussani i, p. 44), amidst a brisk narrative of the 40s B.C., we are told:

> Iulius Caesar triennio et septem mensibus potestate functus perpetua, quia **privati habitum supergressus fuerat**, in senatu graves poenas dedit Cassio Brutoque auctoribus.
>
> Julius Caesar, after he had exercised perpetual power for three years and seven months, since **he had exceeded the dress appropriate for a private individual**, paid a heavy penalty in the senate at the hands of Brutus and Cassius.

In context, the reference can only be to Caesar's clothing (and other adornments) from 45 B.C. to his death, a period in which he was granted some extraordinary sartorial privileges.[40] Not the least or least important of these was the right to appear clad in the robe of a *triumphator* at games

---

people dressed as them, which is a valiant, but not totally convincing, attempt to square the circle.

[38] *Chronography of 354* (148). See in general Tortorici 1993, 332-334. Victor was aware of Tetrarchic construction at Rome: *Caes*. 39.45.

[39] On this text, see Bell jr. 1987, 349-361.

[40] In general, see Weinstock 1971, 270-276; Mommsen 1887, 416, 427-428.

and sacrifices, and to wear the laurel-wreath ἀεὶ καὶ πανταχοῦ, as Dio put it.[41] In this passage, the *De excidio*'s wording is generally close to Josephus (as is the calculation), but the reference to Caesar's clothing is not found in the passages of *The Jewish War* or the *Jewish Antiquities* that were its source at this point – the work's compiler has clearly added it.[42] From whence did he draw it? The compiler of the *De excidio* – whoever that may have been – was heavily influenced by Sallust.[43] He knew both monographs well and he drew extensively on the *Histories* also: his prose is laced with Sallustianisms. The first sentence of book I, for instance, recalls both structurally and verbally a significant early passage in the *Jugurtha*:

Sallust, *Iug*. 5.1	*De excidio* 1.1
Bellum scripturus sum, **quod** populus Romanus cum Iugurtha rege Numidarum gessit, primum quia magnum et atrox **variaque victoria fuit**…	**Bello** Parthico, **quod** inter Macchabeos duces gentemque Medorum diturnum ac frequens **variaque victoria fuit**…

It thus seems very likely that the *De excidio* drew its description of Caesar's fault directly from Sallust. As in Victor, we find here the idea of some powerful Roman going beyond the *habitus* appropriate to him – with Caesar, as with Marius in 104 B.C., the senate is the scene of the action. That is surely the context to which the fragment of Sallust belongs.

---

[41] Weinstock 1971, 271. Games: Cassius Dio 43.43.1 (whence the quotation). Sacrifices: Appian, *BC* 2.16.106. *cf.* Plutarch, *Caesar* 61.3 (during the *Lupercalia*). For the laurels, see also Suetonius, *Caes* 45.2. What seems originally to have been 'triumphal dress' was also a more (sinisterly regal) 'purple dress': Cicero, *Philippics* 2.85; *De divinatione* 1.119; Pliny, *NH* 11.186; Valerius Maximus 1.6.13. Dio does twice mention Caesar's 'royal dress' (44.6.1, 11.2).

[42] Josephus, *BJ* 1.218: Κασσίου καὶ Βρούτου κτεινάντων δόλῳ Καίσαρα κατασχόντα τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐπ' ἔτη τρία καὶ μῆνας ἑπτά. *AJ* 14.270: Καῖσαρ δ'ὑπὸ τῶν περὶ Κάσσιον καὶ Βροῦτον ἐν τῷ βουλευτηρίῳ κτείνεται κατασχὼν τὴν ἀρχὴν ἔτη τρία καὶ μῆνας ἕξ.

[43] See the *Index locorum* in Ussani 1960, 430-431: Sallust was, after Vergil, the author on whom the compiler of the *De excidio* drew most extensively (by some distance). The authorship of the *De excidio* is far from certain: Bell jr. 1987, 350-351 canvases some of the options.

This neat solution to the provenance of Priscian's Sallustian phrase does, however, introduce a problem. The *Jugurtha*, at least as we have it today, ends just before the event described by Plutarch and Livy, literally just before, with a very brief notice of Marius' triumph (114.3-4):

> Sed postquam bellum in Numidia confectum et Iugurtham Romam vinctum adduci nuntiatum est, Marius consul absens factus est et ei decreta provincia Gallia, isque kalendis Ianuariis magna gloria consul triumphavit. Et ea tempestate spes atque opes civitatis in illo sitae.[44]
>
> But after it was announced that the war in Numidia had been finished and Jugurtha, bound, was being brought to Rome, Marius was made consul in his absence and the province of Gaul was voted to him, and on the Kalends of January, the consul celebrated a triumph with great glory. And at that time, the hopes and the safety of the city depended upon him.

So, there would seem to be no room in the *Jugurtha* for the fragment, but, equally, the *Histories* are not an obvious home for it. They commenced only some time after the death of Marius in 86 B.C., with the consulship of Q. Lutatius Catulus and M. Aemilius Lepidus in 78 B.C., as Priscian's quotation of a line from the first book (bk. 15, GLK 3.73) shows: *idem* [*sc.* Sallustius] *in I historiarum: res populi Romani M. Lepido Q. Catulo consulibus ac deinde domi et militiae gestas <conposui>*.[45] Hence, a paradox. While context and intertextual clues makes it obvious to

---

[44] Sallust, *Iug*. 114.3-4.

[45] *cf*. Priscian bk. 15, GLK 3.64: *Sallustius in I historiarum: ac deinde militae et domi gestas conposui*; Rufinus, *Commentatio de numeris oratorum*, GLK 6.575: *'res popu' dactylus, 'li Romani Marco' tres spondei, 'Lepido' anapaestus, 'Quinto Catulo' spondeus et anapaestus, 'consulibus' paeon primus, 'ac deinde' dichoreus sive ditrochaeus, 'militi' dactylus, 'aet domi' creticus, 'gestas' spondeus, composui' choriambus ex longa et brevi et brevi et longa*. See, however, Rawson 1987 for an intriguing and intricate case that Sallust must have provided some

what event the fragment of Sallust refers, there is, at least according to our current understanding, no place in the Sallustian corpus where it can find a home.

But how solid is our grasp on the shape of the *Jugurtha* as a whole? One of the great mysteries of the transmission of Latin literature is how an author as widely read in every age as Sallust came to be transmitted so poorly.[46] A fifth-century manuscript of the *Histories* (written in fine rustic capitals – it was almost square in dimensions) survived until the seventh or eighth centuries, only to be cut up and recycled: as material for bindings and as parchment for a copy of Jerome's *Commentary on Isaiah*.[47] Mere scraps of the *Histories* thus remain – the literal scraps of parchment that survive as well as figurative scraps, the letters and speeches extracted from the text – alongside the hundreds of quotations in grammarians, lexicographers and others.[48] The *Jugurtha* was also treated unkindly by history – Reynolds was even moved to call it 'a text which paradoxically manages to triumph over its own transmission'.[49] In all the earliest manuscripts, a lengthy passage (8,200 characters) towards the end of the work is omitted (103.2 *quinque deligit* to 112.3 *et ratam*).[50] In the late tenth or early eleventh century, this defect was repaired with the aid of an unknown source: the missing portion was either stitched in (with varying degrees of success) or appended to the end. The remaining text after the lacuna, from 112.3 to the work's close, is much shorter than the lacuna itself (a mere 1,700 characters). What

coverage of the horrors of the 80s B.C. in the *Histories*. It is perhaps not a coincidence that Eutropius begins the sixth book of his *Breviarium* (6.1.1): *M. Aemilio Lepido, Q. Catulo consulibus, cum Sulla rem publicam conposuisset, bella nova exarserunt*.

[46] In general, on his transmission, see Reynolds 1983a; *idem* 1991, vi-xvii; Osmond, Ulery jr. 2005. For his ancient reception, see Syme 1964, 274-301. For later periods, Stein 1977 is a good place to start. See also the second part of Bolaffi 1949.

[47] The manuscript is Orléans 192, ff. 15-18, 20 (palimpsest) + BAV, Reg. lat. 1283b (binding) + Berlin, Staatsbibliothek lat. 4° 364 (palimpsest) (*CLA* VI.809, I p. 34, VIII p. 10 – with images). In general, see Bloch 1961.

[48] For the collection of speeches extracted from the *Histories*, which had its own separate transmission, see Reynolds 1983a, 348. The key manuscript is BAV, lat. 3864 (s. ix).

[49] Reynolds 1984-5, 61.

[50] In general: Reynolds 1984-5.

explains this curious situation? It has all the marks of a codicological problem in the archetype, a not uncommon issue in the transmission of both Classical and late-antique works: they are endemic in the *Historia Augusta*, and afflict the *De viris illustribus*, the *De Platone* of Apuleius, Curtius Rufus, the *Natural Questions* of the younger Seneca, and both the *Mathesis* and the *De Errore* of Firmicus Maternus, amongst other texts.[51]

What would that mean in practice? The displaced passage could easily represent a gathering in the archetype of the *Jugurtha*. Were it a quaternion, each folio would have had roughly 1,000 characters: a figure intriguingly close to the number of characters per folio in the dismembered late-antique manuscript of the *Historiae*.[52] This physical unit of text dropped out or was so badly damaged as to be unusable. At 1,000 characters or so per folio, the current final passage would have been in the range of two folios in the archetype. While it is possible that that manuscript concluded with a bifolium, it is equally plausible that the damage which led to the loss of the preceding gathering also resulted in the mutilation of the final one: that, in other words, the end of our *Jugurtha* is not the end of the *Jugurtha*, merely what remained after the text had been mutilated. One other codicological argument perhaps lends support here. As Keyser has noted, it is very likely that the *Jugurtha* was originally written on two rolls of papyrus.[53] At 21,000 words (128,000 characters) in its current state, the *Jugurtha* is exceptionally long by the standards of Latin prose monographs or individual books of more extended works from the first centuries B.C. and A.D, which otherwise cluster at around 11,000 words (a figure which may well reflect the amount of text that could normally be fitted onto a single roll of

[51] *Historia Augusta*: Ballou 1914. *De viris illustribus*: Stover, Woudhuysen 2017, esp. 147. Apuleius: Stover 2016, 49-51. Curtius Rufus: Winterbottom 1983. Seneca, *Natural Questions*: Hine 1983, 376. Firmicus Maternus: Woudhuysen 2018, esp. 168, Stover, Woudhuysen forthcoming.
[52] We used BAV Reg. lat. 1283 pt. B (https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Reg.lat.1283.pt.B) which yields approximately 850 words per folio.
[53] Keyser 1996, 196.

papyrus).[54] Physically, it seems unlikely that so much text was ever crammed onto a single roll of papyrus, let alone that the work generally circulated in such an ungainly form. Yet, if the *Jugurtha* was normally a two-roll job, then there would be ample scope for at least another thousand words or so of text at the end, without straining the limits of papyrus technology. In any case, that ancient readers may well have encountered the *Jugurtha* with a very different textual architecture to the one we know today should perhaps receive greater attention.

In addition to this evidence that the archetype of our tradition of the *Jugurtha* was damaged at its end, there is the troubling fact, pointed out by Keyser in 1996, that we have at least four *testimonia* to it that are not found in the transmitted text:[55]

> Censorinus apud Prisc. 4, *GL* 3.46: 'ultra' praepositio apud Sallustium in Iugurthino: Maurique vanum genus, ut alia Africae, contendebant, antipodas ultra Aethiopiam cultu Persarum iustos et egregios agere (*cf*. Nonius 416 (M), 672 (L): Sallustius in Iugurthae bello Mauri vanum genus. Tertullian, *De Anima* 20: Sallustius vanos Mauros et feroces Dalmatas pulsat; *cf*. Jerome, *Commentarii in IV epistulas Paulinas*, *Ad Galatas* 1.3.1a).[56]
>
> Nonius 129 (M), 188 (L): Sallustius Iugurthino bello: 'amore humanae cupidinis ignara visendi'.
>
> Arusianus E10 *GL* 7.470: egregius haec, Sal. Iug. imperii prolatandi percupidus

[54] This holds true for works of Latin prose *transmitted* as monographs or books – other textual divisions need not reflect original format. The average length of the hundred or so such works that survive from the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* to Velleius Paterculus is 11,000 words and very rarely do they exceed 18,000 words. From the era before Tertullian, only two texts transmitted as single books are longer than the *Jugurtha*: the second book of Cicero's *De oratore* is the worst offender, at 27,000 words, or 3,941 *versus* (sixteen-syllable units used in ancient stichometry), while book two of Velleius weighs in at 22,000 words (3,713 *versus*).
[55] Keyser 1996, 214-216.
[56] Jerome does show knowledge of Sallust's *Historiae*, but here he seems to be drawing on Tertullian: Cain 2009, 39-40.

habebatur, cetera egregius.

Arusianus P5 *GL* 7.498: potitur hanc rem, Sal. Iug. cuncta potiendi.

Attempts (successful or not) have been made to explain away these errant fragments of the *Jugurtha*. It has been suggested that the second is associated with an extant passage in the *Jugurtha* (93.3: *more ingeni humani cupido difficilia faciundi animum adorta*) or that Nonius lifted it from Gellius (*Noctes Atticae* 9.12.22: *more humanae cupidinis ignara visendi*) and did not actually know whence it came.[57] Maurenbrecher wondered whether, in the third and fourth examples, IV (for the fourth book of Sallust's *Histories*) had been corrupted into *Iug*. (IV to IVG).[58] Relying as they do on extraordinary ignorance on the part of late-antique grammarians or on special textual pleading, these solutions are not terribly convincing, as their authors often admit.[59] We might wonder instead, especially given the mutilated state of the *Jugurtha* as we have it, whether these are further evidence that things have gone missing from our text. In 1554, Vincentius Castellanus used the first passage as an example of the sad losses that can afflict texts in the course of their transmission.[60] Since then, determined efforts have been made to cram it into the text of the *Jugurtha*, mostly in a lacuna in chapters 17-19.[61] More particularly, Keyser posited the possibility of a lacuna around *Iug.* 17.3.[62] This is a compelling hypothesis, though it should be noted that the specification of its placement depends on a rather rigid application of the

[57] See Keyser 1996, 215 (*cf*. Garbugino 1978, 65-66). Maurenbrecher 1891-3, i 44.
[58] Maurenbrecher 1891-3, ii 186, 206 (IV.70; *incertae sedis* 32). For the third example, he did also suggest that the text of *Iug*. 63 might be defective.
[59] *e.g.* Maurenbrecher 1891-3, ii 206, with a tentative *fortasse*, or 208 with a note suggesting that the text of the *Jugurtha* varied a lot in the first four centuries A.D.
[60] Osmond, Ulery jr. 2005, 262.
[61] Maurenbrecher 1891-3, ii, 208. Oniga 1995, 117-131. Morstein-Marx 2001, 182 n. 13 is skeptical, though his suggestion that Censorinus and Nonius had an interpolated text of the *Iug*. is not much more satisfactory. Garbugino 1978, 90 assigns it instead to the *Historiae*.
[62] Keyser 1996, 216.

so-called *Lex Lindsay*. This 'law', named for W.M. Lindsay the famous editor of the 'scissors and paste' *De compendiosa doctrina*, holds that: 'the order in which each item appears in each book [*sc.* of Nonius' work] is also the order in which it appeared in the pages of the authors used.'[63] By implication, when we have a quotation from a lost portion of a partially surviving work, it ought to be placed before the first instance of the word or phenomenon for which Nonius cited it in the surviving portion of the text. However, in decades of scholarship since Lindsay's pioneering work, this principle has been refined and qualified: it is generally plausible, but not universally true and it would be unwise to apply it mechanically, especially to an author (like Sallust) whom Nonius knew extremely well.[64] So, while some of the missing words may well have come from an earlier lost passage in Sallust's monograph, it is also possible that the text we have is not complete at the end and that other of the fragments might be located there. Together, both hypotheses neatly explain why a series of grammarians in late antiquity seem to have known a text of the *Jugurtha* different to our own.

It is possible that the late-antique grammarians raise still more and more difficult questions about the transmitted text of the *Jugurtha* than is generally understood. Take Nonius Marcellus: he seems to have had access (directly or otherwise) to a very different text of the monograph.[65] In turn, it is worth asking how secure our grasp on the full original extent of the *De compendiosa doctrina* as Nonius wrote it is.[66] All known manuscripts of the work (none earlier than the ninth century) descend from a single damaged exemplar, in which a leaf from Book 4 had been tucked in after the first leaf of Book 1 (it was copied in there in manuscripts descending

[63] Lindsay 1901, 1 and 3.
[64] See, among many others, White 1980, esp. 191-199; Milanese 2004, 44-5; Velaza 2007, 225-254. Earlier bibliography on the question is compiled in the edition of Varro's Menippean Satires by Astbury 2002, xx-xxi.
[65] In a narrow sense, this was clearly the case, for Nonius had a text of the *Jugurtha* seemingly unaffected by the lacuna: *De compendiosa doctrina* 492 (M), 790 (L) = *Iug*. 107.1; 425 (M), 687 (L) = 106.3; 23 (M), 34 (L) = 103.6.
[66] In general on Nonius, see the still-valuable work of Lindsay 1901.

from that exemplar) and which was missing Book 16, if not other things as well.[67] The text that is actually transmitted is also rife with apparent errors, some of which may reflect Nonian peculiarities, but which in general point to the poor condition of the paradosis.[68] It is thus fairly clear that the original version had considerably more material than is now preserved. There are a few scattered hints that some of this extra material survived rather later than the current condition of the *Compendiosa doctrina* might suggest. The contemporary corrections to Florence, Laur. 48.1 (= F, a ninth-century manuscript) make it reasonably certain that a better text of Nonius' work was available in the early Middle Ages. F^3 (as the corrector is generally known) clearly had access to an exemplar with authentic material not otherwise present in the tradition and which also indicated to him that the transposition of material from Book 4 was a mistake.[69] There are other hints elsewhere that a less mutilated Nonius was available at certain times and to certain people.[70] It is also just possible that a much fuller version of Nonius' work made it to the fifteenth century. The fifteenth-century humanist and bishops of Siponto, Niccolò Perotti, made extensive use of the *Compendiosa doctrina* in compiling his lexicographic companion to Martial, the *Cornu copiae*. The *Cornu copiae* also transmits a large number of fragments from Republican authors not attested elsewhere. Classicists have generally been inclined to dismiss these as of little value (if not actually fabricated for the *Cornu copiae*). Scholars of Perotti, however, have gradually moved to the view that he had access to a more

---

[67] In general, see Reynolds 1983b. For a more expansive account see Bertini 2003; *idem*. 2011a. Rocca 1982, argues that the text has also lost its epistolary preface, which seems eminently plausible.

[68] The fundamental article is Bertini 1967. Butterfield 2013, 63-4 usefully identifies a large number of errors of transmission in the quotations of Lucretius in the *Compendiosa Doctrina*, separating them out from those that seem to be mistakes of memory on Nonius' part and those whose origin is ambiguous.

[69] Briefly: Reynolds 1983b, 251; *cf*. Wood Brown 1895[bis]; Lindsay 1896, 16-18. What the corrector saw is far from certain. It had better readings than F at numerous points and he has asterisked the transposed passage from Book 4, which indicates that he knew something was up. However, as Lindsay pointed out (18), while superior, his exemplar seems to have had the same *lacunae* as the rest of the tradition, for he makes no effort to fill them. So, what F^3 saw was perhaps a copy derived from the archetype before it had suffered some of the losses that afflict it.

[70] Velaza 2008.

complete (whether originally so or late supplemented) version of the *Compendiosa doctrina*, one that transmitted ancient material, even if not all of its attributions were reliable. Perotti has around 30 scraps of Sallust not found in the monographs or fragments of the *Histories* and they deserve a more searching examination than they have perhaps received, as does Perotti's work more generally.[71]

An incomplete *Jugurtha* also solves two puzzles in the history of Latin literature. The first is a general one. Marius' triumph over Jugurtha was one of the most famous incidents in Republican history, repeatedly mentioned in works of the imperial period and late antiquity – yet there is no surviving Latin source for its details.[72] Why was this memorable scene so well known? It is possible that its prominence reflects the influence of Livy's lost 67th book, but it seems rather more likely that it was included at the end of the *Jugurtha*, one of the most influential works of imperial culture: Sallust's monument, as Symmachus called it.[73] The second is to do specifically with the *Jugurtha* itself, for there are also literary reasons to think that something is not right with its close. In 1992, D.S. Levene argued eloquently for understanding the *Jugurtha* as an 'historical fragment', pointing to the puzzling omissions at the end of the text, not least the fact that it does not recount the death of its eponymous character.[74] 'The overall

---

[71] For Perotti, see the 'Appendix' to this article.

[72] A selection: Lucan, *Bellum Civile* 2.69-70, 90, 9.598-600; Propertius, *Elegies* 4.6.65-66; Horace, *Epodes* 9.23; Ovid, *Epitsulae ex Ponto* 4.45-48; Pliny the Elder, *Naturalis Historiae* 33.12; Seneca the Elder, *Suasoriae* 6.26; Velleius Paterculus 2.12.1; Valerius Maximus 6.9.14; *De viris illustribus urbis Romae* 67.1; *Brevis expositio Vergilii Georgicorum* 2.169; Eutropius 4.27.2; Firmicus Maternus, *Mathesis* 1.7.37; Pomponius Porfyrio, *Commentum in Horatium* 9.23; Claudian, *De bello Gildonico* 92, *De bello Pollentino* 128, *De consulatu Stilichonis* 371, *Panegyricus de sexto consulatu Honorii* 381-383; Sidonius Apollinaris, *Carm*. 2.229-230, 255-6. Prudentius, *Contra Symmachum* 1.524-5.

[73] Symmachus, *Ep*. 4.24: *Extant in monumentis Sallustianis Africani litterae, quas Iugurtha post excidium Numantinum testes ad Micipsam decoris sui pertulit*. The short work by Julius Exsuperantius, *De Marii Lepidi Sertorii bellis civilibus*, which draws heavily on Sallust (see Bolaffi 1949, 225-226) gives further reason to think that he was the obvious source for those in late antiquity interested in Marius' career.

[74] Levene 1992, esp. 54-55. In contrast, Koestermann 1971, 388-389 and Paul 1984, 258-259, regard the ending as much more satisfactory. Koestermann rather wonderfully calls it a 'Paukenschlag' or drumbeat. Syme 1964, 176 remarks that 'the monograph ends abruptly', but also says that this creates a certain 'melancholy and irony'; *cf*. his summary on 147. Gsell 1928, 261 also thought the abrupt close to the work deliberate.

result is that the precise point at which the work ends seems arbitrary,' in Levene's words, 'the narrative simply stops rather than being rounded off'.[75] Levene's brilliant insight that something is wrong with the text's close is undoubtedly correct, but he seems not to have considered the possibility that the extant text is *literally*, not literarily, a fragment, imperfect at the end. The lacuna, after all, does strongly suggest that something untoward happened in the final gathering of the archetype and, as we have seen, this could very well have affected the ending. There is nothing inauthentic about the line with which the text now closes (114.4: *ea tempestate spes atque opes civitatis in illo sitae*) as its imitation by Sulpicius Severus in a description of Joseph shows (*Chron.* 1.11.8: *ea tempestate spes atque salus Aegypti in illo sita erat*).[76] Equally, however, there is nothing in Sulpicius that suggests the words are particularly appropriate to an ending. In fact, they come part way through the biblical story, before its climax in Joseph's revelation of his true identity to his brothers.

Given the unreliability of Sallust's transmission, particularly towards the end of the *Jugurtha*, the presence of reliable *testimonia* to that text which have no home in it, the fame in antiquity of Marius' triumph over the African king, for which there is no other obvious Latin source, and the sense that its narrative is incomplete in literary terms, it seems reasonable to entertain the possibility that Sallust's monograph stops where it does today because of physical problems in the archetype. Crucially, an extended ending to the *Jugurtha* solves the riddle of Victor's use of Sallust in his description of Diocletian. On the current consensus, the comparison of Marius and Diocletian in the *De Caesaribus* presents something of a problem. We are to suppose that Victor – who knew Sallust's works very well indeed and used allusion to them to

[75] Levene 1992, 54.
[76] *cf*. Dictys, 2.44: *neque cuiquam dubium, quin ea tempestate tot egregiis ac pulcherrimis eius facinoribus spes omnes atque opes militiae in tali viro sisterentur*.

make complex historical points – found a phrase in the *Histories* that described the physical size of a non-entity (and which never elsewhere was used for such). He then took those words and applied them to the clothing of Marius and Diocletian – who were both famous for at least one instance of dressing in a way that outraged contemporary opinion. This seems both complex and implausible. In contrast, that Victor was instead alluding to the lost ending of the *Jugurtha* neatly reconciles what is at present an awkward bundle of facts. It is much more in keeping with everything we know about the fourth-century historian and his methods.

What might that ending have contained? It is always both difficult and risky to speculate about the lost portions of an otherwise extant work, but on the analogy of the *Catiline* we might expect the *Jugurtha* to have closed with the death of its eponymous subject.[77] Plutarch – our most detailed extant account – leaves the North African king's precise fate a little ambiguous, noting the cold and hunger he experienced in prison, before saying that he paid a fitting penalty for his impious deeds.[78] A Latin tradition was firmer that he was strangled and that may well be what Sallust said had happened: in the *Catiline* he had given a famous description of the grim *Tullianum* in the *carcer* at Rome, the scene of Lentulus's execution with the *laqueus*.[79] Before Jugurtha's death would have come a narrative of Marius' triumph, the current penultimate sentence – *isque Kalendis Ianuariis magna gloria consul triumphavit* – opening a description, rather than briefly dispatching it. It is worth noting that any more extensive description of this

---

[77] Sallust, *Cat*. 61.4.
[78] Plutarch, *Marius* 12.4.
[79] Fate of Jugurtha: Lucan, *Bellum civile* 9.600: *quam frangere colla Iugurthae*. Eutropius 4.27.6: *iussu consulis in carcere strangulatus est* (*cf*. Orosius, 5.15.19). Sidonius Apollinaris, *Ep*. 8.11: *nam domi pressus strangulatusque servorum manibus obstructo anhelitu gutture obstricto, ne dicam Lentuli Iugurthae atque Seiani, certe Numantini Scipionis exitu periit*. *idem*: *Carm*. 2.229: *post guttura fracta Iugurthae*. *cf*. Claudian, *De sexto consulatu* 381-2: *Ipse [sc. Gildo] Iugurthinam subiturus carcere poenam // praeberet fera colla iugo*… Significantly, the wording of the *Periochae* 67 is different, the text saying only that he was *in carcere necatus est* (meaning that he was executed with the *laqueus* – see Adams 1990, 244-245). That perhaps cuts against the Livian origin for the information in Eutropius and Orosius sometimes suggested (*e.g.* Ramsey, Rolfe 2013, 417, n. 324, though tentative). Lentulus: Sallust, *Cat*. 55.3-6.

parade – with its attendant jubilant troops, mournful captives, and display of plunder – would have provided plenty of hooks from which to hang disquisitions on a wide variety of subjects.[80] Moral, ethnographical, and historical topics might all have been included.[81] After the triumph would have followed Marius' entry into the senate – still glittering in his triumphal garb – and the uproar that his appearance provoked, the moment when he had indeed *communem habitum transgressus*. Perhaps the monograph then concluded with Marius, after leaving the Senate, taking up the command voted him at *Jug.* 114.2, if the narrative continued up to that point. There is, in this connection, a tantalising fragment from Perotti (O. 30): *tum propere consul educit exercitum*, 'then with speed the consul led forth his army'. Not only does this (like *Iug*. 114.3) refer to an individual by the title alone, it is also parallel to the swift departure from Rome that opens Plutarch, *Marius* 13.1, where the biographer turns from the triumph to the preparations for the Cimbric wars.

The memorable scene of Marius in the senate, and his subsequent departure, would have been a fitting climax to the *Jugurtha*. Early on, the monograph had established as one of its key themes the challenge to the *superbia* of the *nobilitas* that the North-African war made possible – the idea keeps cropping up thereafter.[82] That challenge was delivered by Marius, but the general was presented throughout as an ambiguous figure, given to *ambitio*.[83] The toxic combination led, with grim predictability, to civil war and the desolation of Italy.[84] What moment captured that contest between *superbia* and *ambitio* better than the victorious general striding into the senate

[80] On the triumph, see in general Versnel 1970; Beard 2007. Weinstock 1971, 60-79 packs a good deal on the subject into a small frame. Östenberg 2009 for the opportunities to display conquered peoples and places as part of the triumph.
[81] For instance, Plutarch, *Marius* 12.4 gives remarkable figures for the quantity of plunder.
[82] The *superbia* of the *nobiles*: *Iug*. 5.1. *cf*. 42.4 (*superbia* becoming common after the fall of Carthage), 82.3 (Metellus acting out of *superbia*), 85.1, 85.46 (Marius attributing the vice to his rivals).
[83] The *ambitio* of Marius is emphasised at 63.6. On his generally ambiguous presentation, see Syme 1964, 160-163.
[84] *Iug*. 5.2.

house in his triumphal garb, to the outrage and fury of the *nobiles*? What ending could be fuller of foreboding for Rome? In the *Jugurtha*'s climactic description of the Marius' entry into the senate, and a distinctive turn of phrase which Sallust used in it, Victor found just the allusion he needed to make a very pointed judgement about Diocletian. He condemned the emperor for his excessive pride and ambition, the products of his humble origin, and moral faults which were clearly revealed by his clothing. It is not a coincidence that the next line of the *De Caesaribus* acidly declares that 'for this reason, it seems remarkable to me that most people ascribe the quality of arrogance (*superbia*) to the nobility (*nobilitas*)'.[85] Victor was not content just to use Sallust's words: the ultimate point of comparing Diocletian with Marius was to reverse the judgment on the *nobiles* which forms the basis of the *Jugurtha*.

Appendix: The Cornu copiae *of Niccolò Perotti*

The *Cornu copiae seu Latinae linguae commentarii* (to give it its full title) is a massive work of Latin lexicography, assembled by the late-fifteenth-century Italian humanist and bishop of Siponto, Niccolò Perotti.[86] Organised as a commentary on the poems of Martial, It offers definitions of words and, in support of them, cites ancient authorities, giving some 12,000 illustrative quotations (give or take).[87] In 1947, R.P. Oliver published a remarkable article, which demonstrated that the *Cornu copiae* preserves a small but significant number of otherwise unattested fragments from ancient Latin authors – in an appendix, he offered a selection of 'new'

[85] *De Caes*. 39.7: *quo mihi mirum videtur* ***nobilitati*** *plerosque* ***superbiam*** *dare*.
[86] There is modern edition of the work: Furno, Charlet 1989-2001.
[87] The figure is that of Oliver 1947, 377. Oliver (377, n. 1) said that 'the arrangement of lexicon in the form of a commentary on Martial was perhaps the most unhappy idea ever conceived in the history of lexicography,' and it would be a bold scholar who dissented.

material from Ennius, Plautus, and Sallust.[88] Oliver argued that a number of factors made it unlikely that these were the invention of Perotti, suggesting instead that they were drawn from late-antique grammatical texts, in particular what he called a 'Nonius Auctus'.[89]

The presence of potentially Ennian material drew the attention of S. Timpanaro. In a 1952 article, he recognised Oliver as having raised 'die wichstige Frage' of recent work on the limits of the Ennian corpus.[90] However, a brief examination left him sceptical. Metrical analysis of the Plautine material showed they were not *senarii* but pseudo-*senarii* and so were obviously 'humanistische Fälschung'. While there was no similar way to assess the Sallust (prose) or Ennius (too short), they were presumably also fake (one of the latter, he pointed out, was in fact a couplet from Vergil).[91] Timpanaro closed by pointing out that Perotti was just as plausibly forged against as forging – misled by some shady character – and noting that O. Skutsch and E. Fraenkel had arrived at the same view as him independently. That, as far as most classicists (especially in the Anglophone world) were concerned, was pretty much that: the line of inquiry that Oliver had opened was never followed up.[92] Perotti surfaces, if at all, only as an example of humanist forgery and no fragments by him have been generally admitted to standard editions.[93] In the decades after 1952, Timpanaro intermittently repeated his judgement, but never further substantiated it.[94]

---

[88] Oliver 1947, 412-424.
[89] Oliver 1947, 400, 404, 408-409. He (esp. 404) left it ambiguous whether he saw the 'Nonius Auctus' as a better witness to the otherwise mutilated text of the *Compendiosa Doctrina*, or a version of that text that had been supplemented. Rocca 1982, 231-232 rightly worries at this distinction.
[90] Timpanaro 1952, coll. 208-209.
[91] Oliver 1947, fr. 1 (412) = Vergil, *Aeneid* 12.903-4.
[92] A search of the *L'Année Philologique* database turns up nothing in English since Oliver, except for Jocelyn 1990, 99-111, on which see below. A notable exception to this general neglect is the very balanced summary in Coleman 2006, lxxxv-lxxxvi.
[93] Forgery: *e.g.* Reynolds 1983b, 252 at n. 17, who thought that Perotti deserved examination 'if only as an example of Renaissance forgery' (with, to be fair, a slight air of caution). Editions: no fragments from the *Cornu copiae* are, for instance, admitted to Skutsch 1985, even among the *spuria* and *dubia*. Bertini 1981, 27 had already noted the curious neglect of Perotti by classicists, as well (28) as Timpanaro's role in condemning Oliver's study.
[94] Timpanaro 1978, 671 *e.g.*

This swift resolution to the questions that Oliver raised is somewhat surprising, for Timpanaro's arguments were not perhaps as convincing as their firm statement would suggest. In general, Timpanaro assumed that the fragments were either authentic quotations from ancient authors, or humanist forgeries. Yet, that dichotomy excludes a range of other (*prima facie* no less plausible) options: ancient or medieval misattribution of genuine material from antiquity (as with the Vergil/Ennius confusion above), for instance. More specifically, Timpanaro rested his judgement on metrical arguments, but as Oliver had been careful to point out, these were not useful standards for assessing Perotti. The latter was (somewhat surprisingly) interested in concision, so, in excerpting material for the *Cornu copiae*, he routinely shortened and adapted his quotations to suit the precise lexical point he wished to make.[95] These normally minor changes obviously played greater havoc with metre than with meaning. So, where an authentic metre in a 'new' fragment might be revealing, false quantities were not damning.[96]

If the case for the prosecution is thus rather weaker than its influence might suggest, it is also worth noting that there are some serious arguments to be made in Perotti's defence. The idea that he invented the fragments has always been weak. The brevity and obscurity of most of his quotations, not mention their inclusion amidst a mass of obviously authentic material, hardly suggests that they were forged to fill out the already over-stuffed *Cornucopiae*. Nor is there any obvious pay-off (financial or reputational) to forging such material for inclusion in a Martial lexicon: the new fragments are not even used to support exotic or controversial definitions. There are none of the obvious signs that something is wrong, the exotic references that tip the reader of Fulgentius' *Expositio sermonum antiquorum* off, for instance: the invented authors, or the delight in suspiciously recondite information. Perotti does not even give the titles of most of the works

[95] Oliver 1947, 378, n. 5; 391-393.
[96] *cf*. Charlet 1990, 41-47, esp. 46-47, reaffirming this point.

from which he had lifted the information and he never hints that what he is providing is novel.[97] It is also worth taking into account his otherwise blameless reputation as a scholar – he appears to have lived up to Dr Johnson's lofty definition of the lexicographer as a 'harmless drudge'.[98] In short, Perotti is a most unlikely scholarly villain and the *Cornu copiae* a very unlikely place for scholarly villainy. It is of course possible that Perotti was a dupe, that he was misled by a contemporary, or that his sources introduced a certain amount of the forged into his lexicon. That, however, is a question that needs to be probed, not an argument against taking Perotti's work – or the evidence it might offer classicists – seriously. It is also worth pointing out that it is far from implausible that Perotti had access to ancient material otherwise lost. He certainly knew a version of Phaedrus' work with thirty-two additional fables, which there is no reason to think anything other than authentic.[99] Given the unsatisfactory condition in which the *Compendiosa doctrina* was transmitted and the fact that more of it was available in the Middle Ages than now, is it a really such a leap to believe that Perotti might have found a 'Nonius auctus'?

It is for these and related reasons that, since the 1950s a number of scholars, largely active in France and Italy, have poured considerable effort into trying to understand Perotti and the *Cornu copiae*.[100] It is difficult to summarise the scope of what they have found – a scholarly achievement that deserves greater attention – but one key conclusion is clear. As J.-L. Charlet – one of the great modern scholars of the *Cornucopiae* – has pointed out, something like a

---

[97] All this as Oliver 1947, 381-2 saw.

[98] On Perotti as a scholar, see Oliver 1947, 382-390 and Charlet 2011 (helpfully organised by the different genres in which he worked). As Oliver points out (385), contemporaries (in the tradition of humanist invective) accused Perotti of all sorts of things, but never cast serious aspersions on his scholarly integrity

[99] Marshall 1983, 301; Boldrini 1988.

[100] The foundational work is still Mercati 1925. Besides his article (1947), see also Oliver 1954. Bertini 1967, 58-61, which largely accepted Oliver's conclusions, was an especially important prompt to further work. See also the collected papers on Perotti in *Res Publica Litterarum* 4 (1981) (especially Bertini 1981) and 5 (1982); Prete 1981a; Monfasani 1981; Prete 1981b; Monfasani 1983; Monfasani 1988; Furno 1995; Stok 2002. There is a very useful survey of important publications down to 2010 in Charlet 2011. Some of the more important studies on Perotti by F. Bertini are collected in Bertini 2011c.

consensus has now emerged that rejects the idea that Perotti made things up, without necessarily accepting that the material he offers is authentically ancient. Perotti was a compiler, not a forger and the value of his citations is likely to rest on their sources and a lot of spadework is still needed to divine what those were.[101] In parallel with this, a number of scholars, led and often inspired by F. Bertini, have become much more comfortable with the idea that Perotti had a 'Nonius auctus' or 'Nonius plenior' and that this reflected not additions to the text of Nonius by medieval copyists, but the full glory of the original.[102] Such would have obvious implications for the 'new' fragments of Classical authors. Incidentally, one of those scholars gradually so convinced was Timpanaro. Towards the end of his life, he declared himself 'assai meno scettico' about 'Nonius Auctus' than he had been for many years.[103]

The only sustained push-back to this idea has come from H.D. Jocelyn, in a bracing essay, combining an extraordinarily detailed knowledge of the history of classical scholarship with a pellucid clarity of argument. There, Jocelyn made a very vigorously-stated case for leaving Perotti's new material in what he described as a scholarly 'limbo'.[104] The 'flimsy' hypothesis of a Nonius Auctus 'dreamed up' by Oliver and Bertini merely 'replaced one mystery with another'.[105] Since we knew nothing solid about Perotti's source, we had no way to assess the quality of the material with which it appeared to have furnished him. Proof of Perotti's good faith and general reliability was thus neither here nor there.[106] Moreover, Jocelyn argued, scholars were a long way from having the kind of fine-grained picture of the world of humanist

[101] Charlet 2011, 37, echoing his earlier conclusions (1990, 46-47). For more recent work, rejecting forgery, but not necessarily asserting authenticity, see, *e.g.*, the various studies of S. Prete: 1986; 1987; 1990.
[102] In particular, see Bertini 1981, 35-36, *cf*. his earlier remarks in Bertini 1967, 67-8; *idem* 1982; *idem*, 2011b; *idem* 1986 (repr. *idem* 2011c, 223-230); *idem*, 2011a; *cf*. Pesce 1985 and Velaza 2008.
[103] Timpanaro 2001, 140, n. 204.
[104] Jocelyn 1990, 99-111, esp. 111.
[105] Jocelyn 1990, 106, 107.
[106] Jocelyn 1990, 103.

Latinity that any closer analysis of the new fragments required.[107] The endeavour, he concluded, was both difficult and unlikely to yield anything of great interest, coming as close as he could to calling it a waste of time, without actually using those words. It may well be that this forceful attack on the idea of 'Nonius Auctus', indeed on the study of the *Cornu copiae*, has contributed to the more general neglect of Perotti by classicists.

That would be unfortunate, because Jocelyn somewhat undersold what Oliver and Bertini had achieved. In particular, he presented their arguments as mere hand-waving: general statements of a view that looked superficially plausible, but fell apart on close inspection. That was rather unfair. Oliver had already demonstrated in painstaking fashion quite how much Perotti owed to Nonius. It was inarguable that the *Compendiosa Doctrina* was one of his most important sources, excerpted word for word throughout his own lexicon: he had even lifted many of his Virgilian quotations from the work.[108] Oliver had also, however, shown that there were very good reasons to think that Perotti's Nonius was unusual. The *Cornu copiae* had quotations from ancient authors that must have come from Nonius, but which agreed in some details with other ancient grammarians (Festus or Gellius, for instance) against the paradosis of the *Compendiosa doctrina*.[109] Several of Perotti's quotations of Sallust's *Histories*, clearly taken from Nonius, had emendations made otherwise only by modern editors.[110] Some of the new fragments, moreover, seemed almost designed to slip into Nonius' text, in portions that were missing the quotations they obviously needed, while others were embedded in the middle of passages lifted wholesale from the grammarian's work, textual corruptions and all.[111] Bertini had added more evidence for

---

[107] Jocelyn 1990, 106-107.
[108] Oliver 1947, 411.
[109] *e.g*. Oliver 1947, 398-399 for Ennius.
[110] Oliver 1947, 402. *cf*. Bertini 2011b, 216-217 for an apparently authentic reading in Plautus (against humanist conjecture more generally) which Perotti preserves.
[111] Oliver 1947, 408- for some examples from Plautus, *cf*. Bertini 1967, 61; *idem* 1982, 10-11; *idem* 1986, 229-230 for an example from Sallust.

the points already made by Oliver, and produced other similar ones of his own devising. He had shown, for instance, that Perotti knew a lot about shoes, more than he could have got from Isidore's *Etymologies* (the obvious source) – the lost book XVI of Nonius was *de genere calciamentorum*.[112] He pointed out that some of Perotti's false attributions could be explained only as a *saut du même au même* from copying out Nonius.[113] Bertini had, however, also gone beyond those sorts of proofs. Crucially, he had demonstrated that Perotti had some material that was attributed to Nonius, but is not in our text of the *Compendiosa doctrina*. John of Salisbury cites Nonius on the etymology of *nuptiae:* Perotti has the same point (unattributed).[114] Perotti corrected (and he loved correction) those who thought that *rubigo* and *aerugo* were the same thing, a view that he explicitly attributed to Nonius, but again not found in his text as we have it.[115] Oliver and Bertini had, in other words, done much more than identify a problem and propose a black-box solution that might be used to explain anything, if scholars were imaginative enough – they had lent 'Nonius Auctus' some real definition. Jocelyn's argument is thus less persuasive than its firm statement might make it seem and, since he wrote, many of the tools whose absence he bemoaned – a critical edition of the *Cornu copiae*, for instance – have been created. The case for masterly inactivity has never been weaker.

What is the relevance of all this to the student of Sallust? Perotti (like all grammarians in the Latin tradition) found much material in Sallust: well over 100 quotations, around 30 of which are not found in the transmitted monographs or the fragments of the *Histories*.[116] These

[112] Bertini 1981, 36. Bertini 1982, 9 later rowed back a little from this conclusion.
[113] Bertini 2011b, 218-219 *e.g.*
[114] Bertini 1981, 35. The connection is particularly interesting, because Perotti had spent time in the circle of William Grey, the bishop of Ely (*ibid*. 29).
[115] Bertini 1982, 10.
[116] Oliver 1947, 401 found 137 quotations from Sallust and 33 'new' fragments (printed 413-417). The *index auctorum* to the modern critical edition (Furno, Charlet 1989-2001, viii 377-378) has more accurate figures and lists 28 *fragmenta incerta*. It is to be regretted that the study of these fragments that Bertini 1981, 32 promised seems never to have appeared: the treatment in *idem* 1986, 227 *ff*. seems briefer than what he had originally envisaged. The

otherwise unattested quotations are generally short – the longest is only fourteen words and most are four or five – and, without context, very obscure. It is difficult to believe that anyone, least of all Perotti, would have gone to the effort of forging them.[117] It is also worth pointing out, as has gone unnoticed before, that the vast majority are written with a metrical rhythm at the end of *clausulae*, in a manner consistent with Sallust's conventions.[118] As discussed above, metrical flaws in Perotti are no real indication of anything, but correct metre is rather intriguing. Future editors of Sallust's works ought to take a good look at what Perotti has to offer, as indeed should classicists more generally.

Justin A. Stover, School of History, Classics and Archaeology, University of Edinburgh.

justin.stover@ed.ac.uk

George Woudhuysen, Department of Classics and Archaeology, University of Nottingham.

george.woudhuysen@nottingham.ac.uk

Bibliography

Adams, J. N., 1990. 'The Uses of *neco* I' *Glotta*, 68.3/4, 230-255.

Aili, H., 1979. *The Prose Rhythm of Sallust and Livy*. Stockholm.

Alföldi, A., 1935. 'Insignien und Tracht der römischen Kaiser' *Mitteilungen des Deutschen*

---

only other analysis of these fragments in any detail is La Penna 1963, 54-55, who notes with bafflement their failure to clearly relate to some Sallustian episode, include a proper name from one of his works, or be plausibly fitted into his narrative, things which any competent forger would surely insert.

[117] Bertini 1986, 228 points out that Perotti cites one of them (Oliver 1947, no. 13) to prove that *nemo* cannot stand for *nullus homo*, when it in fact shows the precise opposite.

[118] The canonical treatment of Sallust's prose rhythm is Aili 1979; see now also Keeline, Kirby forthcoming. A sample (the fragments numbered as in Oliver 1947): 1 *omnes convenere* – double spondee, 3. *Inde discesserat* – double cretic; 5. *militibus fugae se dedit* – double cretic; 6. *discessere* – double spondee; 8. *multitudo advenerit* – double cretic. One must take these under the caution that there are too few for a proper statistical analysis and that we cannot be absolutely certain that they represented the ends of clauses, even if they do all end in verbs.

Archaeologischen Insitutus, Römische Abteilung, 50, 1-171.

Astbury, R., 2002. *M. Terentius Varro. Saturarum Menippearum fragmenta*^{2}. Munich.

Avery, W. T., 1940. 'The Adoratio Purpurae and the Importance of the Imperial Purple in the Fourth Century of the Christian Era' *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome*, 17, 66-80.

Ballou, S., 1914. *The Manuscript Tradition of the Historia Augusta*. Leipzig.

Barnes, T. D., 1981. *Constantine and Eusebius*. Cambridge, MA.

1982. *The New Empire of Diocletian and Constantine*. Cambridge, MA.

Beard, M., 2007. *The Roman Triumph*. Cambridge, MA.

Bell jr., A. A., 1987. 'Josephus and Pseudo-Hegesippus', in L.H. Feldman, G. Hata (eds.), *Josephus, Judaism and Christianity*. Detroit, MI. 349-361.

Bertini, F. 1967. 'Errori nella tradizione manoscritta della *Compendiosa Doctrina*' *Studi Noniani*, 1, 7-66.

1981. 'Niccolò Perotti e il *De compendiosa doctrina* di Nonio Marcello' *Res Publica Litterarum*, 4, 27-41.

1982. 'Tracce del l. XVI del *De compendiosa doctrina* di Nonio Marcello nel *Cornucopiae* del Perotti' *Res Publica Litterarum*, 5, 7-12.

1986. 'Ancora su Nonio e Perotti', in S. Prete (ed.), *Commemoratio: Studi di Filologia in ricordo di Riccardo Ribuoli*. Sassoferrato. 7-11.

2003. 'La fortuna di Nonio dal Medioevo al Perotti, I parte: Da Fulgenzio a Lupo di Ferrières', in *idem* (ed.), *Prolegomena Noniana II*. Genoa. 131-148.

2011a - 'La fortuna di Nonio dal medioevo al Perotti (II parte)', repr. In *idem* 2011c. 279-322.

2011b – 'Spigolando lungo il testo del *Cornucopiae* perottino', repr. in *idem* 2011c. 215-

222.

2011c – *Inusitata Verba: Studi di lessicografia Latina raccolti in occasione del suo settantesimo compleanno da Paolo Gatti e Caterina Mordeglia*. Trent.

Bird, H.W., 1984. *Sextus Aurelius Victor: A Historiogaphical Study*. Liverpool.

Bloch, H., 1961. 'The Structure of Sallust's *Historiae*: The Evidence of the Fleury Manuscript' in S. Prete, S. (ed.), *Didascaliae: Studies in Honor of Anselm M. Albareda*. New York, NY. 61-76.

Bolaffi, E., 1949. *Sallustio e la sua fortuna nei secoli*. Rome.

Boldrini, S., 1988. *Fedro e Perotti: ricerche di storia della tradizione*. Urbino.

Butterfield, D., 2013. *The Early Textual History of Lucretius'* De Rerum Natura. Cambridge.

Cain, A. 2009. 'Tertullian, Cyprian, and Lactantius in Jerome's *Commentary on Galatians*' *Revue d'études augustiniennes et patristiques*, 55, 23-51.

Cameron, A. D. E., 1976. *Circus Factions: Blues and Greens at Rome and Byzantium*. Oxford.

Charlet, J.-L., 1990. 'Sur dix citations d'auteurs antiques dans le *Cornu copiae* de N. Perotti: remarques méthodologiques' *Res Publica Litterarum*, 13, 41-47.

2011. 'Niccolò Perotti, humaniste du Quattrocento: Bibliographie critique' *Renssanceforum*, 7, (M. Pade, C. Plesner Horster (eds.), *Niccolò Perotti: The Languages of Humanism and Politics*), 1-73.

Coleman, K. M., 2006. *M. Valerii Martialis: Liber Spectaculorum*. Oxford.

Degrassi, A., 1947. *Inscriptiones Italiae XIII.1: Fasti Consulares et Triumphales*. Rome.

Evans, R., 1994. *Gaius Marius: A Political Biography*. Pretoria.

Funari, R., 1996. *C. Sallustii Crispi Historiarum Fragmenta*. 2 vols., Amsterdam.

Furno, M., 1995. *Le Cornu Copiae de Niccolo Perotti*. Geneva.

Furno, M., Charlet, J.-L. (eds.), 1989-2001. *Niccolò Perotti: Cornu copiae, seu Linguae Latina comentarii*. 8 vols., Sassoferrato.

Garbugino, G., 1978. 'Il I libro delle *Historiae* di Sallustio in Nonio Marcello' *Studi Noniani*, 5, 39-94.

Gsell, S., 1928. *Histoire Ancienne de l'Afrique du Nord. Tome VII: La République Romaine et les Rois Indigènes*. Paris.

Hine, H. M., 1983. 'Younger Seneca: *Natural Questions*', in Reynolds 1983c. 376.

Hjort Lange, C., 2016. 'The Late Republican Triumph: Continuity and Change' in F. Goldbeck, J. Wienand (eds.), *Der Römische Triumph in Prinzipat und Spätantike*. Berlin. 29-58.

Jocelyn, H. D., 1990. 'The Sources of the *Cornu copiae* of Niccolò Perotti and their Integrity: Some Methodological Remarks', in S. Prete (ed.), *Memores tui: studi di letterature classica ed umanistica in onore di Marcello Vitaletti*. Sassoferrato. 99-111.

Jones, A. H. M., Martindale, J. R., and Morris, J., 1971. *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*, *Volume 1: A.D. 260-395*. Cambridge.

Keeline, T., Kirby, T., forthcoming. '*Auceps Syllabarum*: A Digital Analysis of Latin Prose Rhythm' *The Journal of Roman Studies*.

Keyser, P. T., 1996. 'Nonius Marcellus' Quotations of Sallust' *Wiener Studien*, 109, 181-226.

Koestermann, E., 1971. *C. Sallustius Crispus: Bellum Iugurthinum. Erläutert und mit einer Einleitung versehen*. Heidelberg.

La Penna, A., 1963. 'Per la ricostruzione delle "Historiae" di Sallustio' *Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica* NS, 35.1, 5-68.

2004/05. 'I "flosculi" sallustiani di Aurelio Vittore' *Acta classica Universitatis scientiarum Debreceniensis*, 40/41, 377-384.

Levene, D. S., 1992. ‘Sallust’s *Jugurtha*: An Historical Fragment’ *The Journal of Roman Studies*, 82, 53-70.

Lindsay, W. M., 1896. ‘The Lost “Codex Optimus” of Nonius Marcellus’ *The Classical Review*, 10.1, 16-18.

1901. *Nonius Marcellus Dictionary of Republican Latin*. Oxford.

1903. *Nonii Marcelli de compendiosa doctrina libri XX*. 3 vols., Leipzig.

McGushin, P., 1992-1994. *Sallust: The Histories*. 2 vols., Oxford.

Marshall, P. K., 1983. ‘Phaedrus’ in Reynolds 1983c. 300-302.

Matthews, J. F., 2007. *The Roman Empire of Ammianus*^{2}. Ann Arbor, MI.

Maurenbrecher, B., 1891-1893. *C. Sallusti Crispi Historiarum reliquiae*. 2 fascicles, Leipzig.

Mercati, G., 1925. *Per la cronologia della vita e degli scritti di Niccolò Perotti arcivescovo di Siponto* (*Studi e Testi* 44). Rome.

Milanese, G., 2004. ‘Note su Nonio Marcello e la tradizione grammaticale latine’, in C. Milani and R. B. Finazzi (eds), *Per una storia della grammatica in Europa*. Milan. 43-50.

Mommsen, Th., 1887. *Römisches Staatsrecht*^{3}. 3 vols. in 5, Leipzig.

Monfasani, J., 1981. ‘*Bessarion Latinus*’ *Rinascimento* N.S., 21, 165-209.

1983. ‘Still More on *Bessarion Latinus*’ *Rinascimento* N.S., 23, 217-235.

1988. ‘The First Call for Press Censorship: Niccolò Perotti, Giovanni Andrea Bussi, Antonio Moreto, and the Editing of Pliny’s Natural History’ *Renaissance Quarterly*, 41.1, 1-31.

Morstein-Marx, R., 2001. ‘The Myth of Numidian Origins in Sallust’s African Excursus (*Iugurtha* 17.7-18.12)’ *American Journal of Philology*, 122.2, 179-200.

Nixon, C. E. V., 1981. ‘The Panegyric of 307 and Maximian’s Visits to Rome’ *Phoenix*, 35.1, 70-

76.

Oliver, R. P., 1947. '"New Fragments" of Latin Authors in Perotti's *Cornucopiae*' *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, 78, 376-424.

1954. *Niccolò Perotti's Version of the Enchiridion of Epictetus*. Urbana, IL.

Oniga, R., 1995. *Sallustio e l'etnografia*. Pisa.

Opitz, Th., 1883. 'Sallustius und Aurelius Victor' *Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Paedagogik gegenwartig hersausgegeben von Alfred Fleckeisen und Hermann Masius*, 127, 217-222.

Osmond, P. J., Ulery jr., R., 2005. 'Sallust', in V. Brown, J. Hankins, R.A. Kaster, *Catalogus translationum et commentariorum* 8. Washington, DC. 183-326.

Östenberg, I., 2009. *Staging the World. Spoils, Captives, and Representations in the Roman Triumphal Procession*. Oxford.

Paul, G. M., 1984. *A Historical Commentary on Sallust's Bellum Jugurthinum*. Liverpool.

Penella, R. J., 1983. 'A Sallustian Reminiscence in Aurelius Victor' *Classical Philology*, 78.3, 234.

Pesce, G. M., 1985. 'Tre nuovi frammenti varroniani?' *Studi Noniani*, 10, 231-240.

Prete, S., 1981a. *Osservazioni e note sull'umanista Niccolò Perotti Cittadino veneziano* (*Quaderni di Centro Tedesco di Studi Veneziani* 20). Venice.

(ed.) 1981b. *L'umanista Niccolò Perotti: Congresso di studi umanistic per il quinto Centenario della morte di Niccolò Perotti*. Sassoferrato.

1986. 'Possibilità di ricerche nel *Cornucopiae* di N. Perotti' *Nuovi Studi Fanesi*, 1, 51-80.

1987. 'Frammenti di Apuleio e pseudo-apuleiani nel *Cornu copiae* di N. Perotti' *Nuovi Studi Fanesi*, 2, 39-63.

1990. ‘Sulla recente edizione critica del *Cornu copiae* di N. Perotti’ *Nuovi Studi Fanesi*, 5, 13-21.

Ramsey, J. T., 2015. *Sallust: Fragments of the Histories, Letters to Caesar (Loeb Classical Library* 522*)*. Cambridge, MA.

Ramsey, J. T. (ed.), Rolfe, J. C. (trans.), 2013. *Sallust: The War with Catiline. The War with Jugurtha* (*Loeb Classical Library* 116). Cambridge, MA.

Rawson, E., 1987. ‘Sallust on the Eighties?’ *The Classical Quarterly*, 37.1, 163-180.

Rees, R., 2005. ‘The Emperors’ New Names: Diocletian Jovius and Maximian Herculius’ in L. Rawlings and H. Bowden (eds.), *Herakles and Hercules. Exploring a Graeco-Roman Divinity*. Swansea. 223-239.

Reinhardt, T., Winterbottom, M., 2006. *Quintilian: Institutio Oratoria, Book II*. Oxford.

Reinhold, M., 1970. *History of Purple as a Status Symbol in Antiquity* (*Collection Latomus* 116). Brussels.

Reynolds, L. D., 1983a. ‘Sallust’ in *idem* 1983c. 341-349.

1983b ‘Nonius Marcellus’ in *idem* 1983c. 248-252.

(ed.) 1983c. *Texts and Transmission: A Survey of the Latin Classics*. Oxford.

1984-85. ‘The Lacuna in Sallust’s *Jugurtha*’ *Revue d’Histoire des Textes*, 14-15, 59-69.

1991. *C. Sallusti Crispi. Catilina, Iugurtha, Historiarum fragmenta selecta, Appendix Sallustiana*. Oxford.

Richard, J.-C., 1994. ‘Kalendis Ianuarii: Sur deux épisodes de la carrière de C. Marius’ *Museum Helveticum*, 51.2, 73-87.

Rocca, R., 1982. ‘La *Compendiosa Doctrina* è acefala?’ *Studi Noniani*, 7, 231-238.

Sage, M. M., 1979. ‘The *Elogia* of the Augustan Forum and the *De Viris Illustribus*’ *Historia:*

Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte, 28.2, 192-210.

Salway, B. W., 1994. 'What's in a Name? A Survey of Roman Onomastic Practice from c.700 B.C. to A.D. 700' *The Journal of Roman Studies*, 84, 124-145.

Shackleton Bailey, D. R., 1981. 'Textual Notes on Lesser Latin Historians' *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 85, 155-184.

Skutsch, O., 1985. *Annales: The Annals of Q. Ennius*. Oxford.

Spannagel, M., 1999. *Exemplaria Principis. Untersuchungen zu Enstehung und Ausstattung des Augustusforums* (*Archäologie und Geschichte herausgegeben von Tonio Hölscher* 9). Heidelberg.

Stein, R. M., 1977. 'Sallust for his Readers, 410-1550: A Study in the Formation of the Classical Tradition.' Ph.D. thesis, Columbia University.

Stern, H., 1954. 'Remarks on the "Adoratio" under Diocletian' *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 17.1/2, 184-189.

Stok, F., 2002. *Studi sul Cornu copiae di N. Perotti*. Pisa.

Stover, J. A., 2016. *A New Work by Apuleius. The Lost Third Book of the De Platone*. Oxford.

Stover, J. A., Woudhuysen, G., 2017. 'Giovanni de Matociis and the *Codex Oratorianus* of the *De viris illustribus urbis Romae*' *Exemplaria Classica. Journal of Classical Philology* 21, 125-148.

Forthcoming. 'Julius Firmicus Maternus' in J.A. Stover (ed.), *The Oxford Guide to the Transmission of the Latin Classics*. Oxford.

Syme, R. 1964. *Sallust*. Berkeley, CA.

Timpanaro, S. (tr. F. Bornmann), 1952. 'Der Forschungsbericht: *Ennius*' *Anzeiger für die Altertumswissenchaft*, 5.4, coll. 195-212.

1978. *Contributi di filologia e di storia della lingua Latina*. Rome.

2001. *Virgilianisti antichi e tradizione indiretta*. Florence.

Tortorici, E., 1993. 'Curia Iulia' in M. Steinby (ed.), *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae. Volume Primo: A-C*. Rome. 332-334.

Ussani, V., 1932, 1960. *Hegesippi qui dicitur Historiae libri V*. 2 vols., Vienna.

Velaza, J., 2007. 'La *Lex Lindsay* y el Método de Trabajo de Nonio Marcelo: hacia una Formulacíon Flexible' *Emerita: Revista de lingüística y Filología Clásica*, 75.2, 225-254.

2008. 'Dos Posibles Nuevos Fragmentos del de *Compendiosa Doctrina* de Nonio Marcelo', in A. Cascón Dorado *et al*. (eds.), *Donum Amicitiae: Estudios en Homenaje al Profesor Vicente Picón García*. Madrid, 437-440.

Versnel, H. S., 1970. *Triumphus: An Inquiry into the Origin, Development and Meaning of the Roman Triumph*. Leiden.

Wallace-Hadrill, A., 1982. 'Civilis Princeps: Between Citizen and King' *The Journal of Roman Studies*, 72, 32-48.

1983. *Suetonius: The Scholar and his Caesars*. London.

Weinstock, S., 1971. *Divus Julius*. Oxford.

White, D. C., 1980. 'The Method of Composition and Sources of Nonius Marcellus' *Studi Noniani*. 8, 111-211.

Winterbottom, M., 1983. 'Curtius Rufus', in Reynolds 1983c. 148.

Wölfflin, E., 1874. 'Aurelius Victor' *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* N.F., 29, 285-287.

Wood Brown, J., 1895. 'The Corrections in the Florence MS. of Nonius' *The Classical Review*, 9.8, 396-403 and 9.9, 447-454.

Woudhuysen, G., 2018. 'Uncovering Constans' Image', in D.W.P. Burgersdijk, A.J. Ross (eds.),

Imagining Emperors in the Later Roman Empire (*Cultural Interactions in the Mediterranean* 1). Leiden. 158-182.

2019. ‘Myrmeicus or Myrmecius? *Mnemosyne*, 72.5, 840-860.